

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, and 25, 27-29, and 34-41 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 9, 18, 19, and 27-29 are sought to be amended. Claim 30 is sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claim 41 is sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to Information Disclosure Statement

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 17, 2009 because of “the excess amount of pages within the book...places an extreme burden on the Examiner to evaluate its relevance to the claim [sic] invention since there was [sic] no concise explanations.” In the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 17, 2009, Applicants submitted an entire book, entitled Delivery Push, as possibly being relevant. Applicants submitted the book in an effort diligently comply with the duty to disclose under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the Information Disclosure Statement and consider and acknowledge consideration of the reference.

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 30 because of alleged informalities. Applicants have amended claim 30 in response to the Examiner's objection and respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 18, 27-30, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, on Page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged the features of "an object pointer" and "an attribute pointer," recited in claims 9, 18, and 27-30, lacked antecedent basis. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 9, 18, and 27-30, and independent claims 1, 10, and 19, from which claims 9, 18, and 27, respectively, depend. Applicants assert that the amendments to claims 9, 18, and 27-30 address and overcome the rejection.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the "respective instance methods," recited in claims 9, 18, and 27, lacked antecedent. Claim 9 recites "wherein said object pointer further comprises a vtable pointer for accessing instance methods associated with said object" and "altering said object with respective instance methods accessed using said vtable pointer." Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 clearly indicates that the "respective instance methods" are instance methods respective to "said object" that can be accessed using "said vtable pointer," i.e., two or more instance methods of the "instance methods associated with said object." Claims 18 and 27 recite similar features as a claim 9. Thus, Applicants assert that the "respective instance methods" recited in claims 9, 18, and 27 have antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 34, the Examiner alleged that the features of “an instance method” and “a respective object pointer” lack antecedent basis.

Claim 34 recites:

The method of claim 1, wherein each object pointer of the document table further comprises a vtable pointer that points to an entry in a vtable, *wherein each entry in the vtable comprises at least one function pointer that points to an instance method associated with the corresponding object*, further comprising:

modifying an object of the plurality of objects, comprising:

accessing a vtable pointer associated with the object through a respective object pointer; and

using the vtable pointer to access an instance method associated with the object.

As recited in claim 34, the “respective object pointer” is an object pointer respective to the “object of the plurality of objects.” Furthermore, the “instance method” is an instance associated respective to the “object of the plurality of objects” that can be accessed using a vtable pointer included in the “respective object pointer.” Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the features of “an instance method” and “a respective object pointer” have antecedent basis, in claim 34.

Moreover, the Examiner alleged that the feature of “using the vtable pointer to access an instance method associated with the object” is unclear. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that:

It is unclear to the Examiner how the vtable pointer accesses an instance method when in line 2 of Claim 34 discloses a vtable pointer that points to an entry in a vtable, and lines 3-4 of Claim 34 discloses a function pointer within an entry in the table that points to an instance method. Thus, based on the claim limitations of Claim 34,

a vtable pointer does not point to an instance method, thus it cannot access an instance method; only a function pointer that points to an instance method can access the method.

Even assuming the Examiner’s allegation that the vtable pointer does not point to an instance method is correct, which Applicants do not concede, Applicants note that the vtable pointer is not required to point to an instance method so that it can be used “to access an instance method associated with the object,” as recited in claim 34. Indeed, in an exemplary embodiment, the vtable pointer can be used to access an entry in a vtable, and that entry can be used to access a function pointer that points to the instance method. Thus, the feature of “using the vtable pointer to access an instance method associated with the object,” as recited in claim 34 is clear.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 9, 18, 27-30, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595 to Whitledge et al. (“Whitledge”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,853 to Burkett et al. (“Burkett”).

Claims 4, 13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Burkett in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,709 to Barron (“Barron”). Claims 9, 18, 27, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of

Burkett in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,670 to Lindsay et al. (“Lindsay”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,079 to Gerald et al. (“Gerald”). Claims 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Burkett in further view of Lindsay in further view of Gerald. Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Burkett in further view of Lindsay in further view of Gerald in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,424 to Fallon (“Fallon”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and the Response to the Arguments presented on pages 18-21.

Claim 30 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot.

Independent claim 1 recites a method in which content is parsed into a document having objects. The document is laid out according to properties of a receiving device. The laid out document and a document table are input into a content stream. The document table includes pointers that point to objects in the content stream. The content stream is transmitted to the receiving device.

The receiving device uses the document table to access the document. In particular, the receiving device uses a pointer of the document table to access an object of the document. Independent claims 10, 19, and 28-29 recite similar features as independent claim 1.

As described on pages 36-38 of the instant Specification, in conventional systems, to access and modify a document on a receiving device, the *entire* document must be copied into the writeable memory of the receiving device. Such operation is

often not practical when the receiving device is a mobile device, as mobile devices typically have limited writeable memory.

In contrast, with the claimed invention, it is not necessary for the entire document to be copied into writeable memory of the receiving device. Instead, ***only the particular portion of the document to be modified*** is copied into the writeable memory of the receiving device. This is done as follows. The receiving device receives a content stream including both a document and a document table. The document table has pointers. The device can use these pointers to access portions of the document that one wants to modify. For example, to modify a particular portion of the document, the attribute pointer that points to that portion (object) can be used to access and copy that object to the device's writable memory. This allows that object of the document to be modified without having to copy the entire document to writable memory.

The applied references do not teach or suggest generating a content stream that has therein the document as well as a document table having pointers that point to objects of the document, where such pointers can be used to selectively access and copy portions of the document to the writable memory for modification.

The Examiner asserts (on pages 18-21 of the Office Action) that Whitledge and Burkett suggest elements and pointers to those elements, where those elements and pointers may be eventually input into a content stream. However, even assuming *arguendo* that such interpretation of Whitledge and Barkett is correct, the claimed invention remains patentable over the applied references because the applied references fail to teach or suggest at least:

(1) Generating a document table having pointers that point to objects *in a content stream*. Even assuming *arguendo* that the applied references suggest elements and pointers to those elements, no where do the references teach or suggest that such pointers are valid once the elements and pointers are inserted into a content stream. In the applied references, the pointers may be valid outside the content stream, but once input into the content stream, the pointers would be invalid unless appropriately modified. In contrast, claim 1 recites "wherein each object pointer includes an attribute pointer that points to a respective object *in said content stream*." Such functionality is important with the claimed invention, as the receiving device uses those pointers to access and copy objects from the content stream; thus, the attribute pointers of the claimed invention must be valid inside the content stream.

(2) Transmitting a content stream having objects and pointers to the objects, where the receiving device uses an attribute pointer from the content stream to access and copy an object from the content stream to writable memory of the device. Such functionality enables the receiving device to modify the copied object without copying the entire document from the content stream to the writable memory of said device. The applied references do not teach or suggest this claimed functionality.

Thus, independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-29 are patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30, and their respective dependent claims, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claim 41

New Claim 41 recites similar features, using respective language, as independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-29, and therefore is patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claim 41 be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
Michael Q. Lee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,239

Date: 12/15/09

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1036532_1.DOC